NOTES.

I. MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

AMERICAN CITIES.

City Government in Arkansas.[1]—Municipal corporations in Arkansas are divided into cities of the first and second classes, and incorporated towns. Cities of the first class are required to have, according to the federal census or a state census, a population in excess of 5,000. Cities of the second class have a population lying between 2,500 and 5,000. On satisfactory evidence with reference to the possession of the required population a board composed of the Governor, Attorney-General, and Secretary of State may raise an incorporated town to the rank of a city of the second class, and a city of the second class to the rank of a city of the first class. The constitution gives the legislature power to pass laws restricting the power of taxation, assessment, borrowing money, and contracting debts, in the case of cities, with a view to preventing the abuse of these powers. Under this provision they are prohibited from levying a tax exceeding in any one year five mills on the dollar on the assessed valuation; cities are, however, permitted to levy an additional five mills when this is necessary to pay off indebtedness existing before the constitution of 1874 was adopted. The chief difference between a city of the second class and a city of the first class, as regards governmental organization, is that the latter distinguishes three departments of government, while the former gives executive power and judicial power to the mayor. All contracts and purchases on behalf of the city are, in the case of cities of the first class, made by a Board of Public Affairs. This is composed of the mayor and two citizens chosen by the council. This board has no power to bind the city to any obligation in excess of $50.00 unless the consent of the council has first been obtained. The ultimate control over the charters of the cities is in the hands of the legislature, which may amend the charter of the city, enlarge or diminish its powers, extend or limit its boundaries, divide the same or abolish it altogether without the consent of the inhabitants of the territory. (*Eagle* v. *Beard*, 33 Ark. 497.)

Cities are empowered to provide for waterworks, street railways, and lighting facilities. In this connection franchises may be granted to private companies. Provision is also made for city ownership. When it is decided to create such utilities under city management, a

[1] Contributed by Professor Simon J. McLean, University of Arkansas.

board of three commissioners known as the Improvement District Board is created by the city council. This board has general control. It may borrow money in anticipation of the sums to be raised by taxation for the completion of these works; and money may also be borrowed on the security of the plants themselves. By a law of 1893 it is provided that when waterworks, gasworks, or electric-light works have been completed by such a board, then the city shall have full power to operate and maintain them. In the policy pursued by the cities toward these utilities so far private ownership has been favored. Franchises, varying from ten years in the case of an electric-light plant to fifty years in the case of a street railway, have been granted, the city receiving no bonus for the franchise and no right to participate in the profits. In a number of cases the waterworks have been operated by the cities, and quite successfully. The city of Little Rock has for a number of years had a very efficient electric-light plant under city ownership. At present the question of city ownership of street railways is attracting attention. It is an issue in the pending election in Little Rock. A bill has been introduced in the legislature empowering cities to own and operate street railways. There is a growing feeling in favor of municipal ownership. A recent letter from the mayor of one of the smaller cities, dealing with this matter, contained the statement "We want to own the whole thing."

New York.—The past four months have seen many interesting changes affecting local government and public affairs in the city of New York. Investigating committees, reform movements, legislation and decisions of the courts have combined to make a bewildering complication of events.

Investigating Committees. Late in 1900 two investigating committees came into existence, as the result of disclosures of intolerably vicious conditions in various parts of the city, particularly in the thickly populated lower part of the east side of the Borough of Manhattan. One of these committees, consisting of fifteen members, was appointed under resolution of a meeting of citizens held in the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce. The committee organized in December, with Mr. William H. Baldwin, Jr., as chairman. The other committee was appointed under resolution of the executive committee of Tammany Hall, with Mr. Lewis Nixon as chairman, the four other members being faithful Tammany men. This committee was commonly called the Tammany Purity Committee. It did a large amount of talking, furnished the evidence upon which the successful raid of one pool-room was made, issued a report of no importance and disbanded. The Committee of Fifteen has continued to work, with the avowed pur-

pose of showing that the criminal practices of pool-room keepers and gambling-house keepers, which have been carried on almost openly and with little intervention, can be stopped, and that the failure of the police to do their duty in these matters is the result of corruption. The only publicity given to the work of the committee is that which results from its raids upon pool-rooms and gambling-houses. The committee has made a number of such raids upon warrants, and the keepers of gambling-houses and pool-rooms have been so alarmed that they have ceased to attempt to do business.

Charter Revision. The Charter Revision Commission made its final report to the governor on the first of December, as required by the law creating the commission. The work of the commission is generally regarded as excellent, particularly in view of the insufficient time allowed. The amendments proposed are now before the legislature.[1] Many organizations of citizens urge the enactment of the revision as a whole. It will probably be passed with certain changes. The amendments would (1) give to the mayor full power of removal throughout his term; (2) provide an indefinite term for appointive officials; (3) make the municipal legislature a single chamber, while recognizing and developing the board of estimate and appointment as an "upper house" with fiscal control and having initiative power; (4) increase the control of department finances by the comptroller; (5) give a single head to the police department and separate from it the bureau of elections. The revision would abolish the present central board of public improvements, which has been a body of small value, and would readjust the administrative powers and duties of the city government in a common-sense manner well designed to bring the things to be done and the machinery for doing them into working relations such as the present charter has failed to develop. In the same way, the provisions as to the borough presidents, officers who have done practically nothing, and the local boards of improvements, which have existed only as a useless complication in the municipal machinery, would give to these officers and boards real power and duties of a definite and useful character. The present charter is very largely a body of ordinances and petty regulations. The revision would continue in force sections of this nature, only until the municipal assembly should adopt appropriate ordinances in their place. The result would be to destroy, in large part, the excuse for "charter tinkering." Perhaps the weakest part of the revision is in the provisions as to the board of aldermen. This large body would

[1] Since this note was written the amendments, substantially as here outlined, have been passed, signed by the Governor, and vetoed by the Mayor of New York City, and passed again over his veto.—ED.

be elected entirely by single districts. The corrective tendencies of large districts each electing several candidates have not been recognized by the commission, and no provision is made for the election at large of any other member than the president.

Governor's Message. In his annual message to the legislature, Governor Odell urged the desirability of greater economy in the affairs of New York City, pointing out particularly the extravagant remuneration of certain county officers within the city; recommended "the substitution of a single-headed police commission for the city of New York, such commissioner to be the chief of the police of the city, to be appointed by the mayor, and subject to removal either by the mayor or the governor, and that the present office of a separate chief of police be abolished"; and advised the enactment of laws that would enable the city of New York to control its own water supply, and that would give the city "the same rights that are afforded other municipalities for securing an additional water supply."

The Municipal Campaign. The lines upon which the municipal campaign culminating in the election next November will be conducted have not yet been laid down. The Citizens' Union, the principal campaigning body, will hold a convention in April. The convention is expected to arrange for the appointment of a citizens' committee of seventy, to conduct the independent campaign.[1]

St. Louis.[2]—*State Legislation.* The recent municipal campaign has again forcibly called attention to what appears to be a systematic attempt to corrupt the ballot in St. Louis. The election frauds which have been of late carried on led to a presentment by the February Grand Jury which said, among other things: "We cannot conceive of a more serious state of affairs than that which existed in this city at the time of the election in November, and which we believe still exists to a very great extent." It is the belief of many that the wholesale corruption of the ballot thus indicated is the legitimate result of special legislation enacted by the state legislature with the deliberate purpose of changing the political complexion of St. Louis, which has for some time been republican, while the state is always strongly democratic.

In 1899 the state legislature enacted for cities having a population of over 300,000 (*i. e.* for St. Louis) a new election law and a new police law. The election law known as the Nesbit law was to a great extent a re-enactment, but it contained several provisions which when taken together were calculated to excite suspicion. These provisions, briefly stated, were as follows: (1) The governor was given the power of

[1] Contributed by James W. Pryor, Esq.

[2] Contributed by Professor Robert F. Hoxie, Washington University, St. Louis.

appointing all the members of the board of election commissioners, which board, by a majority vote, was authorized to appoint all election judges and clerks. (2) The law allowed city-hall registration under the supervision of a clerical force appointed by the board of commissioners, and instead of providing for the posting of the published lists a sufficient time before election, it was so worded that lists could be obtained only on demand. (3) The power of the board of commissioners over registration was made complete by constituting it a court of appeals to decide all cases where registration was challenged. (4) The judges appointed by the commissioners were to have, of course, immediate authority over voting. They were to decide cases of challenge at the polls, and were authorized to call upon the police to enforce their decisions, while the law removed the specific penalties previously placed upon police interference with legal voters; and (5) to complete the authority of the board of commissioners over voting, it was constituted a tribunal for deciding all cases arising out of fraudulent voting.

The police law, passed at the same session as the Nesbit law, served to insure that policemen in sufficient numbers to enforce the orders of the judges of elections, and of the right persuasion, should be at the registration and polling places. This bill created a board of four police commissioners to be appointed by the governor (the mayor of the city to be an *ex-officio* member), which was to have power to appoint an indefinite number of policemen, and it was made unlawful for the city to refuse payment to any or all policemen whom the board of commissioners might appoint.

It is evident that the provisions of these two laws just stated, if unchecked, made it practically possible for the dominant party, through the boards of election and police commissioners, to perpetrate unlimited fraud, both in registration and in voting. As a matter of fact, the only checks actually placed upon the power of the dominant party to perpetrate fraud in registration and in voting were the simple provisions that one of the board of election commissioners appointed by the governor and half of the judges and clerks appointed by the election commissioners should be members of the political opposition. The actual result is what might have been expected. The governor evaded the limitation put upon his appointing power, and through a partisan board, partisan judges, partisan clerks, and a partisan police, election frauds were committed in St. Louis that would be considered disgraceful in New York under Tammany control. The indignation aroused by the wholesale corruption at the November election has forced the legislature during the last session to amend the Nesbit law. The amendments, however, fail to eliminate the essentially weak points

of the law, and St. Louis has before her a hard struggle for home rule and purity of elections.

Baltimore.—*The Maryland Ballot Law.*[1] The Maryland Legislature in a special session of seventeen legislative days, lasting from March 6 to 28, passed new ballot and election laws, which, it is claimed, will disfranchise from 40,000 to 60,000 voters. The laws of the session have not yet been officially printed, but from the newspaper accounts the following facts are gathered: The old form of official ballots placed the names of candidates in parallel party columns, with the party name and emblem at the top, and the voter who could not read, was able at least to vote a straight ticket by putting his cross-mark beside the picture of Lincoln or Jackson; an illiterate could demand that the two election clerks enter the polling booth and mark his ballot according to the voter's directions; and a person once legally a resident of the state and not voting elsewhere could return to the state and exercise the right of suffrage although not actually an inhabitant of the state.

The new laws provide for a ballot modelled after that adopted by Massachusetts in the act of 1898; the names of the candidates are arranged in alphabetical order under the name of each office, with the name of the party printed beside that of the candidate, but party emblems are forbidden. The voter must mark each candidate separately, the old straight ticket possibility of course disappearing with the adoption of an alphabetical arrangement; and unless the voter is physically unable to mark his ballot he may not receive assistance from the election officials. Ballots improperly marked are not to be interpreted according to the intention of the voter, as was done under the old law, but to be thrown out altogether. Further, a more stringent system of registration was adopted in order to cut out some of the non-resident voters. In addition to the ballot and registration provisions, the legislature also passed a law for the taking of a new census of the state, claiming huge frauds by the national Republican census-takers in the interest of their own party; and acts for the redistricting of Baltimore and for the erection of a Baltimore city sewer commission which will have the charge of public works, it is said, amounting in value to $20,000,000.

This new election legislation does not expressly impose an educational qualification as does the Massachusetts act, but the complicated form of the ballot amounts to such a restriction. It is admitted by both parties that the new legislation will disfranchise many of the present voters, perhaps to the number of 50,000, of whom by far the larger part will be negroes. The Republicans, in an appeal to the people of the state, claim that the entire legislation of this session is

[1] See also ANNALS, March, 1901, p. 171.

a party measure, aiming through negro disfranchisement, partial registration, party census-taking, gerrymandering, and a partisan sewer commission, to maintain the Democrats in power. The Democrats in turn criticise the national census of the state; claim that the old election law really lends itself to election bribery, and that the Republicans bring into the state at election times thousands of non-residents; and call the present districting act for Baltimore (passed in 1898) as an outrageous fraud, which the new districting measure will remedy. To the objection that the laws will disfranchise many voters, the Democrats reply that Maryland has the best school system south of Pennsylvania, and if the negroes are uneducated, it is their own fault; while the disfranchised whites must be sacrificed for the general welfare of the state.[1]

Minneapolis.[2]—*New Charter.* The proposed new charter, noticed in the ANNALS for November last, was rejected at the polls by a decisive majority. The total vote upon the proposition was so small that the charter could not have been put into operation had the majority been the other way. The chief influences contributing to the defeat of the proposition appear to have been (1) the opposition of organized labor, which claimed that its interests were not sufficiently secured; (2) the opposition of politicians bidding for the support of the charter's real opponents; (3) the indifference of voters who were too much absorbed in the other issues of the election to give any thought to the charter question. The prospect for securing in the near future, a new charter under the present statute, appears very dubious; apparently the requisite total vote upon the proposition cannot be secured at a general election, and a special election finds little favor on account of the expense involved. An attempt is being made to secure a few features of the rejected charter, *e. g.*, the merit system in the police department, by action of the state legislature.

New Primary Law.—Owing to the Republican landslide the last election did not afford a satisfactory test of the influence of the new nomination system upon the subsequent election. The Republican ticket carried several objectioanble candidates, whose defeat might have been expected in a fairly close election under the old system of nominations. All of them were elected, but it is impossible to determine whether their success was due exclusively to the landslide or to the landslide *plus* the influence of the new nomination system. Some close observers believe that the tendency of the new system is to carry through the whole party ticket, regardless of its *personnel;* the voters argue, say these observers, that the nominations having been made by

[1] Contributed by Albert E. McKinley, Ph. D., Philadelphia.

[2] Contributed by Prof. Frank Maloy Anderson, University of Minnesota.

the party, not by the politicians, that fact absolves them from any obligations to inquire into the qualifications of the party candidates. The vote obtained by some of the objectionable candidates (for they ran behind their ticket less than was expected) would seem to sustain this view, but nothing certain can be determined until there is a closer election. Several propositions for the amendment of the primary law are now before the state legislature. All of them relate to the details of the law; there is no suggestion of altering its fundamental principles. The greater number of these propositions are intended to prevent the members of one political party from participating in the selection of the nominees of the other party. In the last primary election, as was perhaps inevitable at the first trial of the system, the rules for voting and counting were not strictly observed; in consequence there is a widespread belief that at least one of the Republican nominees was selected by the aid of Democratic votes. The proposed amendments look to the abolition of this defect in the law.

Mayoralty Contest.—The late mayoralty contest presented an interesting phenomenon for the student of municipal government. In addition to the regular Republican and Democratic nominees there was an independent candidate of exceptional fitness and backed by powerful influences of the "good government" sort. Both of the regular party nominees were objectionable to large sections of their parties and the independent candidate was able to obtain written pledges of support from over 10,000 voters, *i. e.*, from about thirty per cent of the electorate. Yet on election day the independent candidate obtained only a little over 8,000 votes and stood third in the race. The result would seem to demonstrate that in this city no independent candidate can compete successfully with regular party nominees at an election where local questions are liable to be influenced by state and national issues.

Spoils System.—Minneapolis has recently witnessed an application of the spoils principle on a scale seldom, if ever, equaled in recent municipal history. On the day of his inauguration the new Republican mayor removed 105 out of 210 members of the police force and appointed new men in their places. No charges against the removed men were made public; the open and avowed purpose was to make the force Republican; the real purpose, it is generally believed, was to make the police force an effective agency for promoting the personal political interests of the mayor.

Day Labor.—During the summer of 1900 all the city paving was laid by day labor. The city engineer reports that the experiment was eminently satisfactory. The men worked but eight hours per day and were paid the maximum market rates of wages, yet the cost per yard

was less than in previous seasons under the contract system, and the city engineer believes that the work was done better.

Omaha.—*The Official Census.*[1] The results of the twelfth census, as related to this city, have attracted widespread attention. Out of a total of thirty American cities, having a population of over 100,000 each, Omaha is the only one which shows a decrease from the figures of 1890. However, a comparison of the federal census of 1900 with other data, such as the registration list of November, 1900, the city directory for 1900, and the school census, would indicate that the twelfth census has under-counted Omaha, whose actual population shows a substantial gain of nearly twenty-five per cent since 1890. It has long been a subject of current remark that the 140,000 ascribed to Omaha by the eleventh census were far in excess of the real number of its inhabitants. There were many circumstances which encouraged the padding of that census. While it was being taken, the state was in the throes of a political campaign involving the submission of a prohibitory amendment to the constitution, and it was the desire of the anti-prohibitionists to make the growth of the state and its cities appear as large as possible, so as to contrast with the neighboring states of Kansas and Iowa, both of which were then under prohibition, and neither of which had then any large cities. A second motive for padding the census, was found in the desire of politicians, into whose hands the machinery of the census had largely fallen, to secure an increased number of representatives in congress, and also in the electoral college. These and similar causes, operated to bring about a census which the candid, thoughtful and intelligent citizens of Omaha believed, at the time, to be fraudulent and grossly exaggerated.

The League of California Municipalities[2] held its third annual convention in San Francisco, December 12, 13 and 14, Mayor James D. Phelan, of that city, presiding. Secretary H. A. Mason, in his annual report, described the growth of the League from thirteen constituent cities in December, 1898, to sixty-three cities in December, 1900. In connection with the office of secretary, a bureau of information for city officials was established over a year ago. This department has greatly increased the usefulness of the secretary, and with each year the effort will be to make this collection of data concerning municipal administration more complete. Upwards of fifty inquiries from city officials were answered during the past year, including questions relating to legal precedents. The growth of interest in municipal affairs was reviewed in the following words: "The National Municipal League reports 463 organizations engaged in municipal

[1] Contributed by Charles Sumner Lobingier of the Omaha bar.

[2] Contributed by Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Philadelphia.

work. There are state organizations of municipalities and municipal officers in the following states: California, Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Kansas, Wisconsin, Connecticut and Texas. Some of these are merely social organizations, but the majority are organized for practical purposes, and some of them are doing exceptionally good work. I doubt, however, if there is one better organized or having a larger membership than has the California League."

A. H. Breed, of the City of Oakland, submitted the report of the committee on uniform municipal accounting, in which that subject was carefully discussed. An interesting debate followed its presentation. Other reports from the committees on streets, law and legislation were received and discussed. Among the subjects treated in the various papers were "The New Public Library Law," "Municipal Elections," "Water Works," "Weeds and Street Sprinkling," "Electric Lighting Contracts," "Disposal of Franchises" and "What the Cities are Doing." Mr. Joseph Hutchinson, of Palo Alto, was elected president, and Mr. H. A. Mason, re-elected secretary.

Duluth. — *Municipal Advertising.* The friends of municipal ownership of public utilities have generally to encounter not only the obstacles inherent in the business undertakings themselves, but also the opposition of the press which delights to call attention to the shortcomings of the city authorities. When the press is not actually captious in its criticism, it is necessarily indifferent to the details of public administration. The superintendent of the water and light department of Duluth,[1] has undertaken in a novel way to represent clearly, strongly and enthusiastically the merits of his administration. He issues occasionally *The Gas Jet*, a four-page leaflet. Aside from the "true statement" of the results of municipal administration, there are two pages of airy matter designed to stimulate greater patronage as well as greater popular interest in the people's enterprises. The general principle is certainly commendable that administration depends upon education—in default of other agents the city officers might well regard an interesting report as an important factor in educating the public with respect to municipal needs and municipal progress.

FOREIGN CITIES.

Municipal Socialism in France.[2]—Two kinds of municipal socialism can be conceived: the first consists in the fact that a parish takes entire charge of the direction of certain works, such as tramways, water, gas, electric light, in the discharge of its different public duties;

[1] See ANNALS, January, 1901, p. 149.
[2] Contributed by M. André Siegfried, Paris.

the second resides in the intention of a town-council to interfere in an active way, and with a view to modifying it, with the economical system of commercial and industrial liberty, to suppress some definite branch or to transform it into a parochial monopoly for the advantage of the community, or, without going so far, to protect some mode of production or of exchange at the expense of others, or even to enter into competition with private initiative by the creation of a parochial industry or commerce with the aid of the public funds. The first mode of administration cannot be legitimately called socialistic. From the fact that a parish intends managing alone its patrimony, or what can be considered an appendage to its patrimony, it does not follow that it wishes to encroach upon commercial or industrial liberty, and to parochialize certain branches. To the second manner of proceeding alone can be applied with correctness the name of municipal socialism. The Parochial Law of 1884 is silent on the subject of the parish's powers to conduct enterprises. In the absence, therefore, of positive grants of power, the municipality must be guided by the law of 1791, which proclaimed liberty of commerce, industry and labor. Only such undertakings are consistent with this general provision as can be considered essential to the existence of the municipality. Just where the line is to be drawn has been forced into prominence as a practical problem, by the appearance, since 1892, and especially since 1896, of municipal trading in so-called social parishes.

Roubaix. Since 1892 the social parish of Roubaix has doubled the endowment of the benevolent establishments, instituted school canteens, granted pensions to paupers, established cheap eating-houses, reserved funds for sending workmen back to their birthplaces, erected a widows' city of thirty-five houses, distributed clothes including municipal baby linen, created municipal *crèches*, sent about two thousand children to the maritime hospital of St. Pol's sanatorium, built municipal baths, municipal *sweating* houses, etc. So far we have perhaps only an exaggerated hypertrophy of a public duty, the duty of assistance. Central administrative authority did not interfere until Roubaix proposed to create a municipal chemical factory; this was vetoed on the ground that it was competition with private industry and not the mere exercise of a public duty.

Dijon. Dijon, conquered by the socialists in 1896, escaped from them in 1900. During that interval the municipality established *crèches* and school canteens, obtained from chemists a reduction of 50 per cent for the assisted poor and 33 per cent for the syndicated workmen, and inaugurated a subsidy equal to twice their assessment to the syndicated workmen insured against stoppage with a limit of two francs a day.

Poitiers. In 1898, the town council of Poitiers, with a view to obtaining a lower price of bread, decided to encourage the creation of co-operative societies for bread-making and flour-sifting. A trust of 10,000 francs was voted to be put at the disposition of an initial co-operative society. The industrial bakers asked the prefect, and on his refusal, the state council, to annul this vote, as bearing upon an object foreign to the functions of the town council. The state council granted the bakers' claim, and its decision was preceded by the following opinion, delivered by the government commissioner, M. Rouien:

The Limits to Municipal Trading. When the law is silent, it is the business of the state council to settle the limits, in a great measure through the examination of the powers of the local assemblies. The latter cannot, as a principle, follow a business or an industry, firstly, because it constitutes a modification in the economical system of the freedom of commerce; secondly, because it is not without inconvenience that the municipal finances are engaged in the hazards of commercial enterprises. For that reason the state council has not admitted the creation of municipal chemical establishments, and has refused to license the creation of departmental funds for insurance with premiums against fire. But, when the question refers to an industry which, by its nature, constitutes a real monopoly, such as the distribution of water and gas, nothing opposes its being instituted as a public duty. Or if it is established that an undertaking is essential to the protection of the public health, the council will sanction it. On the other hand, the town and general councils cannot, on principle, devote the parochial funds to subsidies in favor of private individuals for the sake of settling the relations between producers and consumers, or between masters and workmen. Thus the state council, at a general meeting, annulled the decisions of the general councils which granted—not aid to the families of strikers, which aid might constitute acts of charity—but subsidies to the strikers themselves during the strike. Again, when the aim is not to interfere with the economical conflicts, but to minister to pressing needs in view of public health or alimentation, in case of the insufficiency of the means furnished by private initiative, the exceptional interference of the town councils is legitimate and legal.

The government commissioner, applying this principle to the affair of the co-operative bakehouse of Poitiers, observed that there existed in Poitiers none of those exceptional cases which can justify the vote for a subsidy. The essay of partial socialization of the bakehouse business attempted by the town of Poitiers was not therefore included, with regard to the actual state of legislation, in the town council's powers, and the municipal ordinance was annulled.

London.—*Sanitary Administration.* The Medical Officer of Health for the Administrative County of London has just issued the report for the year 1899. In addition to the formal report there are three appendices, presenting respectively: (1) Statistics relative to notifiable diseases in the sanitary areas of London in the nine years 1891–99; (2) facts respecting the sanitary condition and administration of Kensington; and (3) respecting the sanitary condition of cemeteries and burial-grounds in and near London. From the last it appears that London requires fifty-five acres per annum for burial lots, plus nine acres for paths and sixteen for neutral belts, or in all about eighty acres. The economy of crematoria is obvious. It is shown that crematoria are authorized in Manchester, Glasgow, Liverpool, Hull, and St. John's, Woking.

The inspectors of the London County Council have sole responsibility for only one or two branches of inspection. For the most part, local district inspectors attend to the routine inspection of nuisances. The results are given in the present report, but with less uniformity of classification than usual. The county inspectors made 23,999 inspections of cowsheds, dairies and milksheds and instituted fifty-five prosecutions; 5,082 inspections of offensive businesses, resulting in ten prosecutions; 28,615 inspections of common lodging-houses, 1,162 of which were by night, fines to the amount of $950 being imposed. Twenty-two districts report the registration and inspection of over 7,000 rented houses, while one district of only 61,000 population reported 7,920 inspections.

With the exception of Bristol and Bradford, London's zymotic mortality rate is the lowest of the English towns having a population of 200,000 or more. The infant mortality, usually regarded as a reliable index of sanitary administration, is the lowest in any except Bristol. The death-rate of London is 19.8 per 1,000 living, just 1 per 1,000 greater than that of Philadelphia and 1.4 greater than that of New York. If these three cities could reduce their mortality rate to that of Amsterdam (15.3) they would save each year over 38,000 lives.

Of special interest to students of the social and economic phases of municipal administration are the tables which show the number of lives and the amount of life capital gained by the decrease of mortality. Taking the decade 1881–90 as a basis of comparison, improved sanitation in London gained for London in the years 1895–99 on the average of 6,610 lives and the amount of life capital of 249,740 years. Add to this the capital saving represented by decreased sickness, and there is material proof to the most sordid taxpayer that there is no better investment than to procure efficient sanitary service. Incidentally it must be apparent that the educational function of the sanitarian's report is socially as important as inspection and prosecution.